

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**  
**(Attorney Docket No. 15574US02)**

In the Application of:	)	
	)	
Rajendra Tushar Morti, et al.	)	Electronically filed on
	)	January 16, 2008
Serial No.: 10/810,462	)	
	)	
Filed: March 26, 2004	)	
	)	
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR	)	
ANTENNA SELECTION DIVERSITY	)	
WITH DYNAMIC GAIN CONTROL	)	
	)	
Examiner: Charles Chiang Chow	)	
	)	
Group Art Unit: 2618	)	
	)	
Confirmation No. 9326	)	

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper summarizes the examiner interview concerning the above-identified application, which was conducted on January 15, 2008. The Applicant requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following comments presented during the interview.

With regard to dependent claims 5, 15 and 25, which stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Suzuki and in further view of Balachandran. In rejecting claims 5, 15 and 25, the Examiner relied on the threshold value and the hysteresis value, as taught by Balachandran, and

on the assertion that the threshold value and hysteresis value represented a prior history of antenna selection as is recited in claims 5, 15 and 25. During the examiner interview, the Applicant pointed out that FIG. 3A from Balachandran teaches that the threshold value and the hysteresis value are predetermined values that are not based on the prior history of antenna selection. The Applicant and the Examiner agreed that Balachandran does not teach a method for determining a specific threshold value or a specific hysteresis value. Since Balachandran does not teach a method for determining a specific threshold value or a specific hysteresis value, the Applicant respectfully submitted that Balachandran does not teach that the threshold value or the hysteresis value represent a prior history of antenna selection as is recited in claims 5, 15, and 25.

The Applicant agreed to amend the claims 5, 15 and 25 as suggested by the examiner to further clarify the language and to further prosecution of the present application. The amendments to the claims were as follows:

5. The method according to claim 2, comprising selecting said starting antenna based on prior history of said selection of said portion of dwelled-on at least one of a plurality of antennas as observed across one or more previous frames.

15. The machine-readable storage according to claim 12, comprising code for selecting said starting antenna based on prior history of said selection of said portion of dwelled-on at least one of a plurality of antennas as observed across one or more previous frames.

25. The system according to claims 22, wherein said processor selects said starting antenna based on prior history of said selection of said portion of dwelled-on at least one of a plurality of antennas as observed across one or more previous frames.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 16, 2008

By: /Ognyan I. Beremski/  
Ognyan Beremski  
Reg. No. 51,458  
Attorney for Applicant

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.  
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60661  
Telephone: (312) 775-8000  
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100  
(RHD)